



2021-2022 Receivership School Quarterly Report #2
 Report Period: *October 16, 2021 – January 14, 2022 (Due January 28, 2022)*

This document is to be completed by the School Receiver and/or their designee and submitted electronically to OISR@NYSED.gov. The reporting portion of this document is a self-assessment of the **implementation and outcomes of key strategies** related to Receivership, and as such, is not considered a formal evaluation via the New York State Education Department. Once finalized and accepted, this document in its entirety *must be posted* in a conspicuous place on the district website. All responses should directly align with or be adaptations to the previously approved intervention plans and require explicit engagement and input from community engagement teams.

| School Name | School BEDS Code | District | Lead Partner or EPO | | Hyperlink to where this plan will be posted on the district website: | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|--|-------|-------|---|
| Sheridan Preparatory Academy | 010100010044 | Albany | N/A | | Receivership: Sheridan Preparatory Academy | | | |
| Superintendent | School Principal (If new, please attach resume) | Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight | Grade Configuration | High School Graduation Rate (If applicable, please provide the most recent graduation rate data available.): | Total Enrollment | % ELL | % SWD | % Students designated as both ELL & SWD |
| Kaweeda G. Adams | Zuleika Sanchez-Gayle Appointment Date: 7/1/2011 | Dr. Cecily Wilson-Turner, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Michele Bridgewater, District Improvement Director | PreK-5 | N/A | 307 | 13% | 14% | 1% |



Executive Summary

Please provide a *plain-language summary* of this completed report, reflecting changes and progress made since the last reporting period, with a focus on the action taken to implement lead strategies, engage the community, and enact Receivership powers. The summary should be written in terms easily understood by the community-at-large. Please avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public and limit the summary to *no more than 500 words*.

Since the last reporting period, we have paid careful attention to student academic data. We've been able to utilize instructional resources, progress monitoring, and unit assessments to measure the growth of our students. Our data has shown us that while we are moving students out of below proficiency and into close to proficient, we are not moving as many students into proficiency. Our instructional staff resources have been allocated heavily into our 3rd - 5th grades, to address the instructional gaps. Many of our students in the intermediate grades are missing foundational skills which impacts their ability to perform at grade level with proficiency. During this quarter, we have been moving "slow" to go fast. Using our reading interventionists to push in during Tier 1 small group instruction time for each of our 3rd - 5th grade homerooms.

Our instructional coaches continue to provide targeted professional development using student data and instructional resources. The coaches have completed coaching cycles with identified staff and with staff who seek their support independently. Our weekly common planning time has been a valuable opportunity for teachers to collaborate, but more importantly, we've begun the practice of peer observation to analyze instructional practices that support student release.

Late during this period we were able to hire a substitute Home School Coordinator who has conducted home-visits to address the barriers families identify they have with regards to attendance. While our chronic absenteeism rate has increased, we have found in the short time the Home-School Coordinator has been on staff, a positive impact, specifically on our students who can recover, despite their current chronic status.

The members of the Community Engagement Team continue to review and provide recommendations to the school improvement plan. Members include school staff, parents, and community members. The community and families were also included through outreach from staff. Outreach strategies included home-visits, meetings with families and community members, open forums (Star Talks with Mrs. Gayle), and through video uploads. The School Receiver negotiated with the Teachers' Union in 2018 and an MOA was passed which added an additional two hours of professional development for instructional staff. There are no changes to the MOA as of this date.



Directions for Parts I, II, and III - District and school staff should respond to the sections of this document by both analyzing and summarizing the steps taken to implement lead strategies since the first quarter. Include processes that were used to assess the **impact** of strategies implemented on student learning outcomes.

This is also an opportunity for district and school staff to provide a reflective outline of proposed actions, strategies, and process adaptations made to the school's 2021-2022 Continuation Plan, with a focus on how evidence guided decisions made through continuous and comprehensive planning, by articulating explicit support of student social-emotional well-being, diversity, equity, inclusion, and active engagement in learning.

- The District should ensure that the implementation of lead strategies address the needs of all learners, particularly the needs of subgroups of students and those at risk for not meeting State academic standards.
- District and school staff should assess the impact of identified lead strategies on student learning, as connected and aligned to diagnostic review feedback, to ensure strategy implementation can achieve long-term sustainable growth.



Part I –Lead Strategies for Improvement

Lead Strategies for School Improvement
 List the 3-4 of core lead strategies that are central to the school’s improvement plan, and outline the progress made this quarter by applying each strategy. Lead strategies are key levers for improvement that are identified based on trends in student performance data and serve as overarching approaches for implementing strategically focused action steps toward achieving demonstrable improvement.

**Quarterly Report #2 with Reflection on Lead Strategies Utilized during
 October 16, 2021 – January 14, 2022**

| Identify the lead strategies that guided the school’s improvement work during the reporting period, including any that were discontinued. | Status (R/Y/G) | For each lead strategy, outline how the strategy helped achieve progress toward this year’s demonstrable improvement targets. If a strategy was discontinued since the prior reporting period, please provide an evidence-based explanation for why it was discontinued and if/how a new strategy will be implemented in its place. |
|---|----------------|--|
| Bi-weekly Common Planning Time (2.5 hours) | G | Common planning time was structured for teachers to understand their student data and make sense of what instructional moves were necessary to increase student achievement. Instructional Coaches led this work. Professional Development focuses on teacher instructional decisions, specifically focusing on how student voice is used for scaffolding Common planning time will be used for teachers to understand their student data and plan for instructional moves necessary to increase student achievement. Based on informal and formal walkthroughs, teacher planning is aligned to New York State Standards, however when implemented, instruction tends to be scaffolded to the disadvantage of student voice and rigor. |
| Weekly Attendance Review Meetings | G | Attendance meetings were moved from bi-weekly to weekly meetings. The reason for this move was to be able to watch ALL students’ attendance on a week-to-week basis. Every week, decisions are made based on students’ change in attendance rate, week-to-week. In order to address our Chronic Absenteeism rate, a “Barriers Worksheet” will be completed with families. The school will develop incentives and address barriers to have a more culturally responsive approach to attendance, that isn’t antagonistic. |
| Use of Pedagogical Flow-map for planning | G | In order to measure if the work being done with grade levels at Common Planning Time, to address the disconnect between planning with standards in mind and instructional practices, has an impact, Administrators are completing walkthroughs to collect anecdotal evidence of follow-through. |



| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| Coaching | | Instructional coaches supported classroom teachers through coaching cycles from group planning, teaching demonstrations, and providing instructional strategies for implementation. This includes ongoing review of student data. The coaching strategy is enhanced this school year, by adding informal walkthroughs from administration to provide feedback to classroom teachers. |
|----------|--|--|

Part II – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 1

Level 1 Indicators

Please list the school’s Level 1 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies inform the implementation of specific strategies and action steps that support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators.

**Quarterly Report #2 Reflection on Activities Completed for this Indicator during
 October 16, 2021 – January 14, 2022**

| Indicator | Status (R/Y/G) | Identify specific strategies and action steps implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. Describe how the data trends that emerged during this reporting period will inform future action steps. Include a description of any adjustments made to the continuation plan along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment. |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|
| #33 3-8 ELA All Students MGP | | Reading teachers in collaboration with classroom teachers developed Tier 1 plans in September using the L. Strong/K. Stahl diagnostic assessments. This allowed for targeted instruction in the area of phonics and comprehension. Every 4 weeks progress monitoring was collected and classroom teachers and reading teachers met to analyze the data and inform instruction. | Easy CBM Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds Class 1: Fall Average: 1 - Mid Point Average: 7- Winter Average: 18 Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased proficiency from 0% to 36% decreased percent below from 54% to 29% Class 2: Fall Average: 3 - Mid Point Average: 5 - Winter Average: 15 Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased proficiency from 19% to 24% decreased percent below from 50% to 29% |



| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Children in grades 1 through 5 are seen by two teachers to receive target instruction during the small group instruction time.</p> <p>Teachers and reading teachers participated in professional development in the area of fluency. Best practices were charted and teachers committed to implementing the strategies.</p> <p>October 2021-November 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing release of lesson and rigor of student tasks.</p> <p>October 2021-November 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring of student data as it relates to rigor and culturally responsive tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>October 2021-January 2022 ELA coach planned and provided four-week coaching cycles that included peer observation to</p> | <p>Class 3: Fall Average: 2 - Mid Point Average: 7- Winter Average: 20 Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased proficiency from 13% to 31% decreased percent below from 63% to 6% <p>Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 10 words - Mid Point Average: 10 words - Winter Average: 19 words Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased proficiency from 21% to 22% decreased percent below from 63% to 56% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 7 words - Mid Point Average: 9 words - Winter Average: 18 words Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased proficiency from 18% to 28% decreased percent below from 65% to 39% <p>Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 30 wpm - Mid Point Average:31 wpm- Winter Average 37 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> decreased proficiency from 21% to 13% decreased percent below from 67% to 57% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 30 wpm - Mid Point Average: 35 wpm- Winter Average: 40 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proficiency stayed the same at 15% decreased percent below from 70% to 50% <p>Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 57 wpm - Mid Point Average: 68 wpm- Winter Average: 88 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proficiency increased from 25% to 30% |
|--|---|---|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks. Based on data (ie. NWEA and walkthrough data).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach engaged in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 ELA instructional coach provided targeted PD to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the processing (i.e. asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities) element of the PFM.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring student data as it relates to questions</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● decreased percent below from 40% to 25% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 53 wpm - Mid Point Average: 58 wpm- Winter Average 73 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 14% to 21% ● percent below from 50% to 58% <p>Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency</p> <p>Class 1: Fall Average: 83 wpm - Mid Point Average: 91 wpm- Winter Average: 111 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 32% to 56% ● decreased percent below from 37% to 25% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 91 wpm - Mid Point Average: 96 wpm- Winter Average: 121 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 31% to 50% ● percent below stayed the same at 13% <p>Class 3: Fall Average: 97 wpm - Mid Point Average: 99 wpm- Winter Average 118 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● decreased proficiency from 44% to 36% ● increased below from 13% to 21% <p>Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency</p> <p>Class 1: Fall Average: 115 wpm - Mid Point Average: 115 wpm- Winter Average: 139 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● proficiency decreased from 27% to 43% ● percent below increased from 47% to 0% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 91 wpm - Mid Point Average: 81 wpm- Winter Average: 113 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● proficiency decreased from 25% to 31% ● percent below increased from 50% to 38% |
|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | <p>that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>November 2021 - January 2022 Teachers, literacy specialists, and the ELA coach met monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.</p> | <p>Class 3: Fall Average: 137 wpm-Mid Point Average: 141 wpm- Winter Average: 146 wpm</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proficiency decreased from 42% to 50% • percent below increased from 8% to 0% <p>Trends: Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in most grade levels. However, one grade level did not show any growth. We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time.</p> |
| <p>#39 3-8 Math All Students MGP</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 The instructional coach provided targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, Domain alignment, progress monitoring, etc.)</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of high leverage Tier 1 launch routines that supports rigorous, standards aligned instruction.</p> | <p>Math Curriculum Assessment</p> <p><u>Grade 3:</u> There were a total of 35 students with valid Quarter 2 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 35 students performed at Level 1 (100%).</p> <p>There were a total of 37 students with valid Quarter 2 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (3.OA.7, 3.OA.9, 3.MD.5, 3.MD.7, 3.OA.3, 3.OA.5 and 3.OA.8). 12 students performed at Level 1 (32%), 6 students performed at Level 2 (16%), 14 students performed at Level 3 (38%) and 5 students performed at Level 4 (14%). The 3rd grade team was able to decrease</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Embedded professional development focused on facilitating high leverage number talk routines to increase student engagement and discourse and to provide access to grade level math instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Coaching cycles were utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines, and accountable talk.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During weekly Common Planning Time meetings teachers provided evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During core instruction time, the launch routine has to be related to the priority standard. Students were actively participating in the number talks and sharing their thoughts.</p> | <p>students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 32% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 16%, students at Level 3 from 0% to 38% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 14%. Teachers are continuing to engage in vertical teaming around priority standards and the progressions amongst the grade levels. Intermediate departmentalized math teachers are engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.</p> <p><u>Grade 4:</u> There were a total of 43 students with valid Quarter 2 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 43 students performed at Level 1 (100%).</p> <p>There were a total of 41 students with valid Quarter 2 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (4.NBT.6, 4.OA.3, 4.NF.1, and 4.NF.2). 23 students performed at Level 1 (56%), 9 students performed at Level 2 (22%), 5 students performed at Level 3 (12%) and 4 students performed at Level 4 (10%). The 4th grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 56% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 22%, students at Level 3 from 0% to 12% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 10%. Teachers are continuing to engage in vertical teaming around priority standards and the progressions amongst the grade levels. Intermediate departmentalized math teachers are engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Grade 5:</p> <p>There were a total of 35 students with valid Quarter 1 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 40 students performed at Level 1 (100%).</p> <p>There were a total of 31 students with valid Quarter 2 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (5.NBT.7, 5.NF.1, 5.MD.2, 5.NF.2, 5.NF.4, 5.NF.5 and 5.NF.6)). 31 students performed at Level 1 (100%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%) and 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%). The 5th grade team was unable to move students to proficiency based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards. Teachers are continuing to engage in vertical teaming around priority standards and the progressions amongst the grade levels. Intermediate departmentalized math teachers are engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.</p> <p>Trends: All students were level 1 to begin the year, our practices are moving students, however we are not moving students to proficiency at this time. This signals that we need to continue our focus on Tier 1 practice through our professional development.</p> |
| #100 ELA All Students Core Subject PI | | October 2021-November 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing release of lesson and rigor of student tasks. | <p>Easy CBM</p> <p>Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds Class 1: Fall Average: 1 - Mid Point Average: 7- Winter Average: 18 Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased proficiency from 0% to 36% |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>October 2021-November 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring of student data as it relates to rigor and culturally responsive tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>October 2021-January 2022 ELA coach planned and provided four-week coaching cycles that included peer observation to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks. Based on data (ie. NWEA and walkthrough data).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach engaged in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 ELA instructional coach provided targeted PD to all instructional staff on researched based</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● decreased percent below from 54% to 29% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 3 - Mid Point Average: 5 - Winter Average: 15</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 19% to 24% ● decreased percent below from 50% to 29% <p>Class 3: Fall Average: 2 - Mid Point Average: 7- Winter Average: 20</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 13% to 31% ● decreased percent below from 63% to 6% <p>Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency</p> <p>Class 1: Fall Average: 10 words - Mid Point Average: 10 words - Winter Average: 19 words</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 21% to 22% ● decreased percent below from 63% to 56% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 7 words - Mid Point Average: 9 words - Winter Average: 18 words</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 18% to 28% ● decreased percent below from 65% to 39% <p>Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency</p> <p>Class 1: Fall Average: 30 wpm - Mid Point Average:31 wpm- Winter Average 37 wpm</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● decreased proficiency from 21% to 13% ● decreased percent below from 67% to 57% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 30 wpm - Mid Point Average: 35 wpm- Winter Average: 40 wpm</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● proficiency stayed the same at 15% ● decreased percent below from 70% to 50% |
|--|---|---|



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>strategies that support the processing (i.e. asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities) element of the PFM.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring student data as it relates to questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>November 2021 - January 2022 Teachers, literacy specialists, and the ELA coach met monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.</p> | <p>Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 57 wpm - Mid Point Average: 68 wpm- Winter Average: 88 wpm Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proficiency increased from 25% to 30% • decreased percent below from 40% to 25% Class 2: Fall Average: 53 wpm - Mid Point Average: 58 wpm- Winter Average 73 wpm Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased proficiency from 14% to 21% • percent below from 50% to 58% Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 83 wpm - Mid Point Average: 91 wpm- Winter Average: 111 wpm Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased proficiency from 32% to 56% • decreased percent below from 37% to 25% Class 2: Fall Average: 91 wpm - Mid Point Average: 96 wpm- Winter Average: 121 wpm Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased proficiency from 31% to 50% • percent below stayed the same at 13% Class 3: Fall Average: 97 wpm - Mid Point Average: 99 wpm- Winter Average 118 wpm Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decreased proficiency from 44% to 36% • increased below from 13% to 21% Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 115 wpm - Mid Point Average: 115 wpm- Winter Average: 139 wpm Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proficiency decreased from 27% to 43% • percent below increased from 47% to 0% </p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 91 wpm - Mid Point Average: 81 wpm- Winter Average: 113 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proficiency decreased from 25% to 31% • percent below increased from 50% to 38% <p>Class 3: Fall Average: 137 wpm-Mid Point Average: 141 wpm- Winter Average: 146 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proficiency decreased from 42% to 50% • percent below increased from 8% to 0% <p>Trends: Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in most grade levels. However, one grade level did not show any growth. We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time.</p> |
| <p>#110 Math All Students Core Subject PI</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 The instructional coach provided targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, Domain alignment, progress monitoring, etc.)</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of high leverage Tier 1 launch routines that supports rigorous, standards aligned instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December2021</p> | <p>Math Curriculum Assessment</p> <p><u>Grade 3:</u> Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed.</p> <p><u>3.OA.7:</u> The team was able to increase proficiency from 37% to 78%.</p> <p><u>3.MD.5:</u> The team was able to increase proficiency from 80% to 97%</p> <p><u>3.MD.7:</u> Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students performing at a Level 1 from 97% to 3% and increase students scoring 2 points from 0% proficiency to 75%.</p> <p><u>3.OA.3:</u> The team was able to increase proficiency from 17% to 67%</p> <p><u>3.OA.5:</u> The team was able to increase students scoring full credit from 23% to 86%.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Embedded professional development focused on facilitating high leverage number talk routines to increase student engagement and discourse and to provide access to grade level math instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Coaching cycles were utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines, and accountable talk.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During weekly Common Planning Time meetings teachers provided evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During core instruction time, the launch routine has to be related to the priority standard. Students were actively participating in the number talks and sharing their thoughts.</p> | <p><u>3.OA.8:</u> Based on a 3 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the percentage of students performing at a Level 1 from 80% to 6% and increase proficiency on the 2 point response problem from 6% to 72%.</p> <p><u>Grade 4:</u> Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed.</p> <p><u>4.NBT.6:</u> Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to increase proficiency on the multiple choice from 2% to 44% and decrease students who scored 0 points from 87% to 41% and increase students who earned 1 point from 13% to 59%.</p> <p><u>4.OA.3:</u> There were 2 questions that addressed this standard on the Quarter 2 Post Assessment. The team was able to decrease the students who performed at a Level 1 from 71% to 34% and increase proficiency on the 2 point problem from 2% to 37%.</p> <p><u>4.NF.1:</u> There were 2 questions that addressed this standard on the Quarter 2 Post Assessment. The team was able to decrease the students who performed at a Level 1 from 87% to 41% and increase proficiency on the 2 point problem from 21% to 54%.</p> <p><u>4.NF.2:</u> There were 2 questions that addressed this standard on the Quarter 2 Post Assessment. The team was able to increase proficiency on the 2 point problem from 0% to 39% and 14% to 24%.</p> <p><u>Grade 5:</u> Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed on the Quarter 2 Post Assessment.</p> <p><u>5.NBT.7:</u> Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students scoring 0 points from 67% to 37%, increase students scoring 1 point from 31% to 57% and increase students scoring 2 points from 3% to 7%.</p> <p><u>5.NF.1:</u> Based on a 3 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students scoring 0 points from 54% to 33%, increase students scoring 1 point from 46% to 60% and students scoring 2 points from 0% to 7%.</p> |
|--|--|---|



| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | | <p><u>5.MD.2:</u> Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students scoring 0 points from 100% to 63%, increase students scoring 1 point from 0% to 37%, 0% of the students were able to score 2 points.</p> <p><u>5.NF.2:</u> Students worked through a multiple choice question and showed their work to support their answer. The team was able to increase proficiency from 10% to 37% on the multiple choice question and 13% to 37% justifying their answer.</p> <p><u>5.NF.4:</u> Based on a 1 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease students who scored 0 points from 85% to 43% and increase students who scores 1 point from 15% to 57%.</p> <p><u>5.NF.5:</u> The team was able to increase proficiency from 31% to 37% proficiency.</p> <p><u>5.NF.6:</u> Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students who scored 0 points from 90% to 47%, increase the students who scored 1 point from 10% to 53% and maintained 0% for students who scored 2 points.</p> <p>Trends: All students were level 1 to begin the year, our practices are moving students, however we are not moving students to proficiency at this time. This signals that we need to continue our focus on Tier 1 practice through our professional development.</p> |
| <p>#150 Grades 4 Science All Students Core Subject PI</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 (K-5th) Instruction on the importance of active student engagement with the three dimensions of learning: Science and Engineering Practices, Disciplinary Core Ideas, and Crosscutting Concepts.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 (K-5th) Spotlight on the various uses of science journals and the essential need for a writing</p> | <p>There were a total of 35 students with valid Quarter 2 Science Checkpoint data. 5 students performed at Level 4 (14%), 13 students performed at Level 3 (38%), 6 students performed at Level 2 (17%) and 11 students performed at Level 1 (31%). We were able to decrease the students at Level 1 from 96% to 31%, increase students at Level 2 from 4% to 17%, students at Level 3 from 0% to 38% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 14%. We were able to increase student proficiency in the areas of Weather patterns from 7% to 83%, Metric Units from 31% to 63% and opinion statements from 19% to 63%. In addition, the PD around the 2 point response has increased student proficiency around extended response questions from 10% and 26% to 89% and 94 % respectfully. Students were also able to increase their</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>component. Has included 8 practices with a special focus on 1, 3, 4, &5.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asking questions and defining problems 3. Planning and carrying out investigations 4. Analyzing and interpreting data 5. Using mathematics and computational thinking <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Community school coordinator has had the opportunity to attend science trainings. Closer collaboration around building level STEM activities has been focused to ensure integration and alignment with Next Generation expectations.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Building and instructional supervisor conducted walkthroughs and classroom visits on a core group of 2nd-5th grade science teachers with a focus on effective implementation of labs, and the embedding of Science and Engineering Practices 1,3,4,5 followed-up by written and/or face to face feedback.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to instructional staff.</p> <p>September 2021 - January 2022</p> | <p>proficiency surrounding interpreting data tables from 22% to 66%. The following areas have been identified as instructional focus areas, erosion and deposition and animal adaptations. Departmentalized Science Teachers will continue to engage in PD around the 2 point response and will continue to learn about explicit instruction on how to answer and justify your response with evidence. Teachers have surpassed sentence writing and are moving into the 2 point response criteria. Teachers are also building centers around science concepts including erosion and deposition and animal adaptations. In addition, students are beginning to work through the performance labs through a center model. Students will continue to be engaged in center activities (reading, writing, hands-on experiments and virtual simulations) to build their understanding of these science concepts.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Instructional coaches provided professional development on high leverage routines that can be implemented within the Pedagogical Flow-Map to promote student engagement, high level thinking, and rigorous tasks.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Grade 3-4 students took the FOSS written and performance pre-assessment, to note instructional needs in anticipation of taking the new grade 5 science assessment (June 2023).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Staff engaged in 2nd-5th lab based training with primary resource Full Option Science Systems(FOSS).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Administrators conducted informal/formal walkthroughs to collect evidence of student voice.</p> | |
| <p>#160 EM Chronic Absenteeism - All Students</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 Home school coordinator conducted home-visits a minimum of 3 days per week to families whose attendance rate falls below 91%.</p> <p>September 2021 - January 2022 Weekly attendance meetings occurred to monitor all students' attendance. Decisions were made based on student year-to-date and period-to date</p> | <p>48% of our students are currently listed as Chronically Absent. The attendance rate for each grade level: Kindergarten: 89.68% 1st grade: 89.59% 2nd grade: 87.48% 3rd grade: 91.65% 4th grade: 88.42% 5th grade: 89.82% The overall attendance rate for the building is 89.56%</p> |



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>rates to design student success plans using our Community School model’s Pillars. Weekly meetings were chaired by home school coordinator, with principal, community school site coordinator, school secretary, behavior specialist and social worker.</p> <p>September 2021 - January 2022 Administrative staff had “pop-up” dance party for classes that have 100% attendance daily.</p> <p>September 2021 - January 2022 Attendance study hall was offered to students who are absent from school as an opportunity to catch up on school work missed as an after school program. Students were selected by the Attendance Committee based on weekly attendance rates.</p> <p>September 2021 - January 2022 PBIS in conjunction with the Attendance Committee utilized the November (11/24, Responsible) Blue & Gold Day to educate students on the importance of good attendance.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Kickboard App has been used by all staff as the primary 2-way communication with families.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022</p> | <p>As the school year progressed into the winter months, our attendance rate continued to decline and our chronically absent students increased. Our school was directly impacted by the pandemic, with families refusing to send students to school, during the uptick. When the District moved to distance learning for a week and half, our attendance for virtual, was the best its ever been. In late December we hired a substitute for our Home School Coordinator. Since this hire, we’ve seen a gradual improvement in the attendance of our students on the cusp of being chronically absent. We currently have 57 students who will be chronically absent for the school year, with no hope to recover, this is 19% of our total population. We will need to focus on the 77 students who are currently chronic, but can still recover their attendance to keep us on track to meet our indicator metric.</p> |
|--|---|--|



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Monthly, home-school coordinator visited classes individually to distribute attendance incentives to students who have 95+% attendance and those who have the most improvement (10/1, 10/29, 11/24, 12/22, 1/28).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Community school site coordinator hosted a monthly Attendance Breakfast of Champions for the parents/families of students who have 95+% attendance (10/1, 10/29, 11/24, 12/21, 1/28).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Monthly recognition of top three classes with best attendance at Blue & Gold Day. Classes received a trophy and banner to hang on their door. 1st place class received attendance incentives (9/24, 10/29, 11/19, 12/17, 1/28).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 The community schools site coordinator used student data (NYS exams and NWEA data) to share with Community Engagement Team (CET), so that partnerships and resources were selected to support the academic needs of students. CET meets bi-monthly (August, October, December).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2021 The community schools site coordinator reported monthly to BLT any recommendations provided by</p> | |
|--|---|--|



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>the C.E.T. to support the goals of the comprehensive plan.</p> <p>November 2021 - November 2021 To keep families informed of where their student is, the Attendance Committee distributed personalized Attendance Tier Letter with report cards quarterly.</p> <p>January 2022 - January 2022 BLT analyzed attendance data for September 2021 - December 2021 to make adjustments in interventions and support services to address chronic absenteeism.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

Part III – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 2

| Level 2 Indicators | | | |
|---|----------------|---|---|
| Please list the school's Level 2 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies will inform the implementation of specific strategies and action steps that will support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators. | | | |
| Quarterly Report #2 Reflection on Activities Completed for this Indicator during October 16, 2021 – January 14, 2022 | | | |
| Indicator | Status (R/Y/G) | What specific strategies and action steps were implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. Describe how the data trends that emerged during this reporting period will inform future action steps. Include a description of any adjustments made to the continuation plan along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment. |
| | | | |

#35
3-8 ELA Black Students
MGP

October 2021-November 2021
Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing release of lesson and rigor of student tasks.

October 2021-November 2021
Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring of student data as it relates to rigor and culturally responsive tasks.

October 2021 - November 2021
The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).

October 2021-January 2022
ELA coach planned and provided four-week coaching cycles that included peer observation to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks. Based on data (ie. NWEA and walkthrough data).

October 2021 - January 2022
Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach engaged in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.

Easy CBM

| Black Gr. 3-5 | Fall | Winter |
|------------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 10 | 26 |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 28 | 26 |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 27 | 23 |

| Black Gr. 3 | Fall | Winter |
|------------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 10 | 10 |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 7 | 7 |

| Black Gr. 4 | Fall | Winter |
|------------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 3 | 12 |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 12 | 7 |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 14 | 14 |

October 2021 - November 2021
 ELA instructional coach provided targeted PD to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the processing (i.e. asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities) element of the PFM.

November 2021 - December 2021
 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.

November 2021 - December 2021
 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring student data as it relates to questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.

November 2021 - December 2021
 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).

November 2021 - January 2022

| Black Gr. 5 | Fall | Winter |
|------------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 6 | 9 |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 6 | 9 |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 6 | 2 |

Trends:

There was movement of students into Tier 1 at all grade levels, however our number of students at Tier 2 and Tier 3 remained relatively consistent. This demonstrates a need to continue supporting our 3rd-5th grade students at Tier 2 and Tier 3. We will also need to consider analyzing if there is a difference in how this subgroup performed compared to others.



| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | | <p>Teachers, literacy specialists, and the ELA coach met monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.</p> | | | |
| <p>#41 3-8 Math Black Students MGP</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 The instructional coach will provide targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, Domain alignment, progress monitoring, etc.)</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of high leverage Tier 1 launch routines that supports rigorous, standards aligned instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Embedded professional development will focus on facilitating high leverage number talk routines to increase student engagement and discourse and to provide access to grade level math instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines, and accountable talk.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During weekly Common Planning Time meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional</p> | <p>Math curriculum assessment</p> | | |
| | | | <p>Black Grade 3</p> | <p>Pre-assessment</p> | <p>Post-assessment</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 1</p> | <p>94%</p> | <p>38%</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 2</p> | <p>6%</p> | <p>24%</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 3</p> | | <p>19%</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 4</p> | | <p>19%</p> |
| | | | | | |
| | | | <p>Black Grade 4</p> | <p>Pre-assessment</p> | <p>Post-assessment</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 1</p> | <p>100%</p> | <p>70%</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 2</p> | | <p>7%</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 3</p> | | <p>22%</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 4</p> | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | <p>Black Grade 5</p> | <p>Pre-assessment</p> | <p>Post-assessment</p> |
| | | | <p>Level 1</p> | <p>100%</p> | <p>100%</p> |



| | | <p>strategies through student work and ACSD data points.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During core instruction time, the launch routine has to be related to the priority standard. Students will be actively participating in the number talks and sharing their thoughts.</p> | <table border="1" data-bbox="1446 237 2591 443"> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 4</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Trends: All students were level 1 or 2 to begin the year, our practices are moving students, however we are not moving enough students to proficiency at this time. This signals that we need to continue our focus on Tier 1 practice through our professional development.</p> | Level 2 | | | Level 3 | | | Level 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|---|---------------|------|--------|------------------------------|----|----|------------------------------|----|----|------------------------------|----|----|-------------|------|--------|------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|----|----|------------------------------|---|---|
| Level 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>#102 3-8 ELA Black Core Subject PI</p> | | <p>October 2021-November 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing release of lesson and rigor of student tasks.</p> <p>October 2021-November 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring of student data as it relates to rigor and culturally responsive tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> | <p>Easy CBM</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1446 808 2053 1070"> <thead> <tr> <th>Black Gr. 3-5</th> <th>Fall</th> <th>Winter</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of Students at Tier 1</td> <td>10</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of Students at Tier 2</td> <td>28</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of Students at Tier 3</td> <td>27</td> <td>23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="1446 1144 2115 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th>Black Gr. 3</th> <th>Fall</th> <th>Winter</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number of Students at Tier 1</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of Students at Tier 2</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of Students at Tier 3</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Black Gr. 3-5 | Fall | Winter | Number of Students at Tier 1 | 10 | 26 | Number of Students at Tier 2 | 28 | 26 | Number of Students at Tier 3 | 27 | 23 | Black Gr. 3 | Fall | Winter | Number of Students at Tier 1 | 1 | 5 | Number of Students at Tier 2 | 10 | 10 | Number of Students at Tier 3 | 7 | 7 |
| Black Gr. 3-5 | Fall | Winter | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 10 | 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 28 | 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 27 | 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black Gr. 3 | Fall | Winter | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 10 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 7 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

October 2021-January 2022
 ELA coach planned and provided four-week coaching cycles that included peer observation to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks. Based on data (ie. NWEA and walkthrough data).

October 2021 - January 2022
 Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach engaged in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.

October 2021 - November 2021
 ELA instructional coach provided targeted PD to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the processing (i.e. asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities) element of the PFM.

November 2021 - December 2021
 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.

November 2021 - December 2021

| Black Gr. 4 | Fall | Winter |
|------------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 3 | 12 |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 12 | 7 |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 14 | 14 |

| Black Gr. 5 | Fall | Winter |
|------------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Students at Tier 1 | 6 | 9 |
| Number of Students at Tier 2 | 6 | 9 |
| Number of Students at Tier 3 | 6 | 2 |

Trends:

There was movement of students into Tier 1 at all grade levels, however our number of students at Tier 2 and Tier 3 remained relatively consistent. This demonstrates a need to continue supporting our 3rd-5th grade students at Tier 2 and Tier 3. We will also need to consider analyzing if there is a difference in how this subgroup performed compared to others.



| | | <p>Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring student data as it relates to questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>November 2021 - January 2022 Teachers, literacy specialists, and the ELA coach met monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|-------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|-----|-----|---------|----|-----|---------|--|-----|---------|--|-----|
| <p>#115 3-8 Math ED Core Subject PI</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 The instructional coach provided targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, Domain alignment, progress monitoring, etc.)</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of high leverage Tier 1 launch routines that supports rigorous, standards aligned instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021</p> | <p>Math curriculum assessment</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1446 971 2588 1308"> <thead> <tr> <th>ED Grades 3</th> <th>Pre-assessment</th> <th>Post-assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level 1</td> <td>97%</td> <td>55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td>3%</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;"></td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 4</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;"></td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | ED Grades 3 | Pre-assessment | Post-assessment | Level 1 | 97% | 55% | Level 2 | 3% | 13% | Level 3 | | 18% | Level 4 | | 15% |
| ED Grades 3 | Pre-assessment | Post-assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 | 97% | 55% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | 3% | 13% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 3 | | 18% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | 15% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



| | | <p>Embedded professional development focused on facilitating high leverage number talk routines to increase student engagement and discourse and to provide access to grade level math instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Coaching cycles were utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines, and accountable talk.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During weekly Common Planning Time meetings teachers provided evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During core instruction time, the launch routine has to be related to the priority standard. Students were actively participating in the number talks and sharing their thoughts.</p> | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ED Grades 4</th> <th>Pre-assessment</th> <th>Post-assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level 1</td> <td>100%</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td></td> <td>19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td></td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 4</td> <td></td> <td>6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ED Grades 5</th> <th>Pre-assessment</th> <th>Post-assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level 1</td> <td>100%</td> <td>75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td></td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td></td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 4</td> <td></td> <td>2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Trends: All students were level 1 or 2 to begin the year, our practices are moving students, however we are not moving enough students to proficiency at this time. This signals that we need to continue our focus on Tier 1 practice through our professional development.</p> | ED Grades 4 | Pre-assessment | Post-assessment | Level 1 | 100% | 64% | Level 2 | | 19% | Level 3 | | 11% | Level 4 | | 6% | ED Grades 5 | Pre-assessment | Post-assessment | Level 1 | 100% | 75% | Level 2 | | 2% | Level 3 | | 22% | Level 4 | | 2% |
|---|----------------|--|--|-------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|------|-----|---------|--|-----|---------|--|-----|---------|--|----|-------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|------|-----|---------|--|----|---------|--|-----|---------|--|----|
| ED Grades 4 | Pre-assessment | Post-assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 | 100% | 64% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | | 19% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 3 | | 11% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | 6% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ED Grades 5 | Pre-assessment | Post-assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 | 100% | 75% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 2 | | 2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 3 | | 22% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 4 | | 2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>NWEA Math Growth CGP - Grades 1 & 2 Cohort</p> | | <p>September 2021 - January 2022 The instructional coach provided targeted professional development around the</p> | <p><u>1st Grade:</u></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, Domain alignment, progress monitoring, etc.)</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of high leverage Tier 1 launch routines that supports rigorous, standards aligned instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Embedded professional development focused on facilitating high leverage number talk routines to increase student engagement and discourse and to provide access to grade level math instruction.</p> <p>October 2021 - December 2021 Coaching cycles were utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines, and accountable talk.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During weekly Common Planning Time meetings teachers provided evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points.</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022 During core instruction time, the launch routine has to be related to the priority standard. Students were</p> | <p>There were a total of 32 students with valid Quarter 2 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 2 students performed at Level 3 (6%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 30 students performed at Level 1 (94%).</p> <p>There were a total of 31 students with valid Quarter 2 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 1.OA.1, 1.OA.6, 1.MD.4 and 1.NBT.1). 14 students performed at Level 1 (45%), 2 students performed at Level 2 (7%), 4 students performed at Level 3 (13%) and 11 students performed at Level 4 (35%). The 1st grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 45% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 7%, students at Level 3 from 6% to 13% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 35%. Teachers are continuing to engage in planning around priority standards and how to increase student dialogue during the launch and explore parts of a math lesson. The 1st grade team is engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.</p> <p>Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed.</p> <p><u>1.OA.1 (adding within 20)</u>: The team was able to increase proficiency from 3% to 52%.</p> <p><u>1.OA.1: (adding within 20)</u>: The team was able to increase proficiency from 41% to 55%.</p> <p><u>1.OA.1: (subtracting within 20)</u>: The team was able to increase proficiency from 9% to 55%.</p> <p><u>1.MD.4 (interpreting data from a graph)</u>: The team was able to increase proficiency from 47% to 74%.</p> <p><u>1.MD.4 (graphing data)</u>: The team was able to increase proficiency from 6% to 61%.</p> <p><u>1.NBT.1 (extending the counting sequence to 120)</u>: The team was able to increase proficiency from 44% to 77%.</p> <p><u>2nd Grade:</u> There were a total of 42 students with valid Quarter 2 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 42 students performed at Level 1 (100%).</p> |
|--|---|--|



actively participating in the number talks and sharing their thoughts.

There were a total of 41 students with valid Quarter 2 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (2.NBT.5, 2.NBT.9, 2.OA.1, 2.NBT.7, 2.MD.7 and 2.MD.8). 31 students performed at Level 1 (75%), 4 students performed at Level 2 (10%), 6 students performed at Level 3 (15%) and 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%). The 2nd grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 75% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 10% and students at Level 3 from 0% to 15%. Teachers are continuing to engage in planning around priority standards and how to increase student dialogue during the launch and explore parts of a math lesson. The 2nd grade team is engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.

Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed.

2.NBT.5 and 2.NBT.9 (adding with regrouping): The team was able to increase proficiency from 19% to 56%.

2.NBT.5 and 2.NBT.9 (solving multi-step word problems with addition and subtraction): The team was able to increase proficiency from 10% to 29%.

2.NBT.5 and 2.NBT.9 (using place value understanding to explain and justify their thinking): The team was able to increase proficiency from 2% to 32%.

2.NBT.5 and 2.NBT.9 (subtraction with regrouping): The team was able to increase proficiency from 2% to 20%.

2.NBT.7: (adding and subtracting within 1,000): The team was able to increase proficiency from 0% to 7%.

2.MD.7: The team was able to increase proficiency from 0% to 15%.

2.MD.8: The team was able to increase proficiency from 0% to 17%.

Trends:

Our data shows movement within individual standards and domains for math in First and Second Grades, however, we are not moving students to overall proficiency. We will continue to



| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>work on our Tier 1 practices related to math, increasing student voice and spiraling in pre-requisite standards through launch routines.</p> |
| <p>NWEA Reading Growth CGP - Grades 1 & 2 Cohort</p> | | <p>October 2021-November 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing release of lesson and rigor of student tasks.</p> <p>October 2021-November 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring of student data as it relates to rigor and culturally responsive tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>October 2021-January 2022 ELA coach planned and provided four-week coaching cycles that included peer observation to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks. Based on data (ie. NWEA and walkthrough data).</p> <p>October 2021 - January 2022</p> | <p>NWEA & Easy CBM</p> <p>Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 10 words - Mid Point Average: 10 words - Winter Average: 19 words Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 21% to 22% ● decreased percent below from 63% to 56% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 7 words - Mid Point Average: 9 words - Winter Average: 18 words Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● increased proficiency from 18% to 28% ● decreased percent below from 65% to 39% <p>Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency Class 1: Fall Average: 30 wpm - Mid Point Average:31 wpm- Winter Average 37 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● decreased proficiency from 21% to 13% ● decreased percent below from 67% to 57% <p>Class 2: Fall Average: 30 wpm - Mid Point Average: 35 wpm- Winter Average: 40 wpm Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● proficiency stayed the same at 15% ● decreased percent below from 70% to 50% <p>Trends: There was movement of students into Tier 1 at all grade levels, however our number of students at Tier 2 and Tier 3 remained relatively consistent. This demonstrates a need to continue supporting our 3rd-5th grade students at Tier 2 and Tier 3. We will also</p> |



| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach engaged in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.</p> <p>October 2021 - November 2021 ELA instructional coach provided targeted PD to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the processing (i.e. asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities) element of the PFM.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Administrators conducted informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 Common Planning Time (CPT) focused on monitoring student data as it relates to questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities.</p> <p>November 2021 - December 2021 The Building Leadership Team (BLT) met with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the</p> | <p>need to consider analyzing if there is a difference in how this subgroup performed compared to others.</p> |
|--|---|---|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>walkthroughs to support the planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to the instructional staff (Student Voice, Rigor, and Equity).</p> <p>November 2021 - January 2022 Teachers, literacy specialists, and the ELA coach met monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

Part IV – Community Engagement Team (CET)

Community Engagement Team (CET)

The role of the Community Engagement Team is to be active thought partners in contributing to and supporting the development of recommendations for school improvement through public engagement. Recommendations made by the CET, including how the school community (i.e., school principal, parents and guardians, teachers and other school staff and students) was engaged to seek input/feedback to guide implementation of the school's improvement plan, should be addressed in response to the prompts below.

Report Out of 2021-22 CET Plan Implementation

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List the categories of stakeholders that have participated as members this reporting period. Include any changes made to the CET's membership since the development of the Quarter #1 Report. Include the role/title of any new members. | Describe how recommendations made by the CET during this reporting period were used to inform implementation of the school's improvement plan. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators Teachers Parents Community School Site Coordinator Home School Coordinators | The CET team met on February 8, 2022 to review and discuss the implementation of the improvement plan and made recommendations prior to the submission of this quarterly report. |



| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Members• School Program Providers <p>No changes made to the CET.</p> | |
|---|--|

Part V - Receivership Powers

Powers of the Receiver
Provide a summary of the use of the School Receiver’s powers during this reporting period.



The School Receiver negotiated with the Teachers' Union, and an MOA was passed which added an additional two hours of professional development for instructional staff. Each of these professional development hours have been directly connected to the SCEP strategies identified above to lift practices of instructors as it applies to CORE ELA and MATH instruction.

Part VI – Assurance and Attestation

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the information in this Receivership Quarterly Report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge; and that all requirements with regard to public hearings and the Community Engagement Teams, as per Commissioners Regulation §100.19 have been met.

Name of Receiver (Print): _____
Signature of Receiver: _____
Date: _____

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the Community Engagement Team has had the opportunity to provide input into this Receivership Quarterly Report, and has had the opportunity to review, and update if necessary, its 2021-2022 Community Engagement Team plan and membership.

Name of CET Representative (Print): Martha Musser _____
Signature of CET Representative: *Martha Musser* _____
Title of CET Representative: Community Member _____
Date: 2/8/22 _____